SOME

QUERIES

TO THE

PROTESTANTS

Concerning the

English Reformation.

By *T. W.* Gent.

✠

Published with Allowance.

LONDON,

Printed by *Nathaniel Thompson* at the Entrance into the *Old Spring-Garden* near *Charing-Cross*, 1687.

Some *Queries* to the *PROTESTANTS*, *concerning the* Engliſh *REFORMATION*.

THe *Church* of *England* is either the whole *Catholick Church*, or a *Member* thereof; If a *Member* only, name me that Church or Congregation under the Sun, whoſe *Sacraments* and *Liturgy* ſhe embraces, unleſs ſhe have cut her ſelf off from the reſt of the *Body*?

Does ſhe allow the *Sacraments* of *Lutherans* or *Calviniſts*?

From whence was *Cranmer*, that firſt Patriarch or Reformer of the *Church* of *England*, ſent? Who gave him Authority to Preach his Reformed Goſpel? Was it juſt or honeſt for him to riſe up againſt the *Church* of *Rome*, by virtue of a *Commiſſion* from her received? And if ſo, I pray inform me whether a Biſhop or Miniſter fallen from the *Church* of *England*, may not alſo take upon him to Preach againſt the *Church* of *England*, by pretence of the *Orders* received from her Hands?

Whether want of *Miſſion* be not an errour in the Foundation of any Church? It being *Theft* and *Robbery* (as our Saviour hath taught us) not *to enter by the door into the Sheep fold.*

Whether *Cranmer* enter'd by the *Parliament-door*, or by the Gate of the *Scriptures*? But this latter is the old Song of *Hereticks* and *Sectaries*, perpetually boaſting of *Scripture*, I demand therefore, does not the *Bible* admit of various Interpretations? Whence of neceſſity ſome Judge is to be aſſign'd, to determine which is the true *Interpretation*, unleſs your inclinations be to wrangle to all Eternity.

To theſe *Queries* I have often-times deſired an Anſwer, but never yet met with any. If you pretend (as many do) that *Cranmer* and his Aſſociates derived their *Holy Orders* from Chriſt and his Apoſtles, by the hands of *Roman Catholick* Biſhops. It follows inevitably, that *Roman Catholick* Biſhops did alſo receive their *Orders* from Chriſt and hi Apoſtles, and conſequently are true Biſhops; and there-

fore to be heard. By this Answer the *Protestants* seem to me, to destroy their own Cause. But you will say perhaps, that *Roman Catholick* Bishops did receive their *Orders*, not their *Doctrine* from Christ and his Apostles; Very good: I would fain know then, by whose Authority the first *Reformers* rose up against the *Doctrine* of the *Church* of *Rome*? Untie this knot, or confess that *Cranmer*, *Luther*, *Calvin*, *Socinus*, &c. made themselves *Judges*, *Witnesses*, and *Accusers*.

But the more common Answer is, that every National Church may Reform it self. Be it so: Then it follows, *Scotland* may Reform it self to *Calvinism*, *Saxony*, to *Lutheranism*, &c. Moreover, 'tis false, that the change of Religion was made here in *England* by Vote of the National Church, or Clergy of *England*. No, no, but by the giddiness of a *Few*, during the Minority of *Edward* VI. being then a Child of Ten years old. Read the *Annals* of those times, (even *Fox* himself) where 'tis evident, that almost all the *English* Bishops (*Cranmer*, and two or three more excepted) were utterly against the pretended *Reformation*.

Yet let us suppose, but not grant, Religion to have been Reform'd here by the Major part of the *English* Clergy: I understand not how it may be Lawful for the Church of *England*, being in actual Communion with the *Catholick Church*, to seperate it self from the rest of the Body. If you say this was not done by any fault of the *English* Church, but of the Church of *Rome*, obtruding on the World her *Errours* and *Corruptions*; I answer in short, that all *Pereticks* (themselves being *Judges*,) will escape Condemnation. And further, let the *Reader* take notice, that all *Presbyterians* are wont to urge this very instance in their own defence against the Church of *England*, to wit, that they have left only the *Errours* and *Corruptions* of the *English* Church.

Whether the true Service of God hath been corrupted throughout the whole World before *Cranmers* rise? If not, tell

tell me in what Provinces of the Earth did it exist? Whether among the *Waldenses*? But I am ignorant from whence *Peter Waldo*, the *Merchant* of *Lyons*, received his *Mission*. Nor do I know whether his *Sacraments* are approv'd by the Church of *England*.

Whether at this day there be no Pure and Apostolical Service of God in the World, except that establish'd by Law in *England* and *Ireland*? Whether it be Lawful for the People of *England* to invent a Church to themselves, divided from all the rest of the Christian World? By what Authority do they censure the *Sacraments* and *Rites* of the *Roman* Church?

Whether *Cranmer* was the first Arch-Bishop of the Church of *England*? The reason of my doubt, is, because the Arch-Bishops of *Canterbury* for nine preceding Ages were all *Roman Catholicks*? If he was the first, he wanted Episcopal Succession, because he being the first of his Sect, he succeeded to none. Then how could he be a Lawful Pastor, who had neither Succession, Mission, nor Miracles to recommend his *New* Doctrine? I say *New*, and strange at that time, and for many Ages before.

Whether that be a true Church that wants Lawful Pastors? And whether Pastors, not Lawful and True, can be said to have true Sacraments? If not, then, is it not better to Communicate under *One Kind* with *Catholicks*, than under *No Kind* with *Reformers*?

Whether the XXXIX. *Articles* of the Church of *England* be *Articles of Faith*, yea or no? If not, then no body is bound to believe them nnder pain of *Damnation*. If they be, then hath the Church of *England* invented new *Articles of Faith* besides those XII. instituted by Christ and his Apostles.

Whether the Reformed Religion may not be divided and sub-divided into endless Reformations?

Whether in the matter of the *Eucharist*, the Argument drawn from our *Senses* be not fallible? The reason of this question

queſtion is, becauſe the *Serpent* deceiv'd our firſt *Parents* by perſwading them to believe their *own Eyes* rather than the *Word of God*. As that *they ſhould eat of the Tree of knowledge becauſe it was fair to the Eye*. Now if *Mankind* were ſo deceiv'd by their *Sight*, pray whence ſhould their other *Senſes* deſerve more credit?

Whether the Church of *England* be not changable according to the various inclinations of *Engliſh Parliaments*?

Whether the Spirit of *Calvin* denying, and that of *Luther* affirming a *Corporal Preſence* of Chriſt in the *Sacrament*, be the ſame Spirit? If not then both cannot be of God.

Was not *John Calvin* a moſt impudent Creature in aſſuming to himſelf the office of *Reforming* the *World*, being yet but a young Man of 25 or 26 years of age, and that without all pretence of *Miracles*, a thing which Chriſt himſelf undertook not under 30 years of Age.

Whether, from the Womb of the *Reformation* have not iſſued all thoſe Slaughters, Rapines, Tumults, Plundring of Churches, Schiſms, and Civil Wars which broke out in the year 1641?

Whether *Africa* produces more variety of *Monſters*, than *Britain* does *Fanaticks*, where every Man may Read, and Interpret the Scriptures according to his own Judgement of Diſcretion?

Whether Queen *Elizabeth*, born of *Ann Bolen*, (Queen *Katherine* yet living,) can be thought Legitimate?

How admirable was the Wiſdom of *Henry* VIII. by expelling one *Pope* of *Rome*, to raiſe up infinite *Popes* of his own Subjects.

By whoſe Authority did he Divorce his Virtuous Wife Queen *Katherine*? His own, or a Foreign? If by his own, why may not other Kings alſo put away their Wives at their pleaſure? If *Mary* his Daughter by Queen *Katherine*, was Legitimate Heireſs of the Kingdom, then *Elizabeth* was not; becauſe it was not Lawful for King *Henry* to have two Wives at once.

If that Religion be Sacred that's Eſtabliſh'd by Law, why did Queen *Elizabeth* deſtroy the *Catholick Religion* Eſtabliſh'd by ſo many Acts of Parliament?

Elizabeth Expell'd 14 *Catholick* Biſhops from their *Seet* for refuſing the Oath of Supremacy. But how could they Swear her to be Head or Supream Governeſs of the Church, when they could not Swear ſhe was Head of the Kingdom?

Did not *Cranmer* and his *Reforming Aſſociates* ſteal their *Liturgy* out of the *Roman Miſſal*, *Ritual* and *Breviary*?

Are not *Proteſtants* bound by their Oath of Supremacy to obey the King as Supream Governour, as well in all Spiritual or Eccleſiaſtical Things or Cauſes, as Temporal? What mean they by theſe words, *As well in all Spiritual as Temporal Things or Cauſes*, &c. But that *Proteſtants* are Sworn to yield to the King all manner of Obedience, both Civil and Religious? Are they not obliged therefore according to this Oath, to become *Catholicks* with a *Catholick* King, *Calviniſts* with a *Calviniſt* King? *Arians* with an *Arian*? I ſay according to this Oath, becauſe the King's Majeſty is the only Supream Governour (under Chriſt) as well in all Spiritual as Temporal Cauſes. Which words confeſs in the King a Spiritual as well as Civil Juriſdiction. But whence does his Spiritual Juriſdiction appear without the *Power* of the *Keys*?

You will ſay the King is to be obey'd ſo far as we may by the Laws of God, and the Kingdom. Be it ſo, then it follows, that the King is not Supream Governour under Chriſt, but the *Laws* of God and the Kingdom. And what if Controverſy ariſe between the King and his Subjects about the true Senſe of *Scripture*? Who ſhall be Judge? the private Spirit, or not? Hence, if I am not miſtaken, came the *Riſe* of our late *Civil Wars*.

Why did ſo many Noble Men under *Edward* VI. and Q. *Elizabeth*, ſo readily embrace the *Reformation*? Was't for Conſcience-ſake, or the Lucre of *Church-Lands*.

Why do *Engliſh-men*, (ſo deſirous of *Novelties*,) hate *Popery*?

Popery? Perhaps becauſe *Popery* is no *Novelty*.

The Church of *England* is either Fallible, or Infallible; if Fallible (as is conſeſt by all) then is ſhe not founded upon a *Rock*, becauſe ſhe may Deceive, and be Deceiv'd.

Whether Cardinal *Wolſey* did wiſely by Demoliſhing *Monaſteries* to Found *Colledges*? The reaſon of this doubt is, becauſe the *Tree* of *Knowledge* was not the *Tree* of *Life*.

Is there not wanting in the Church of *England* a more correct Tranſlation of the *Bible*? Many material Errours being found in our preſent *Engliſh Bible* tending to *Schiſm* and liberty of the *Fleſh*. For Inſtance, *Gal* 5.17. *Dan.* 4. 24. where the Prophet ſpeaks thus to King *Nebuchadnezar*, *Quamobrem, Rex, conſilium meum placeat tibi, & peccata tua eleemoſynis redime, & iniquitates tuas miſericordiis Pauperum.* Which Text the preſent *Engliſh* Tranſlation thus renders, viciouſly enough. *Wherefore O King, break off thy Sins by Righteouſneſs, and thine Iniquities by ſhewing mercy to the Poor.* Whereas it ought to have been Tranſlated, *Redeem thy Sins by Alms-deeds, and thine Iniquities by ſhewing mercy to the Poor.* Again, how are St. *Paul's* words to the *Corinthians* miſ-rendred, 1 *Cor.* 7. 9. *Quod ſi non ſe continent, nubant*; *But if they cannot contain, let them Marry*; where this word (*cannot*) not being found in the *Greek*, was deviſed in favour of the *Fleſh*.

Likewiſe the words of Chriſt, *Matt.* 19. 11. are corrupted in favour of the Fleſh, *Non omnes capiunt verbum iſtud ſed quibus datus eſt.* All Men (*cannot*) receive this ſaying, but ſuch to whom it is given. It ought to be, all Men *do not* receive this ſaying. Alſo the words of *Job*, Chapter 7. 1. and many other Texts, eſpecially, *Exod.* 20. 4. in hatred of the *Picture* of our Saviour. *Non facies tibi ſculptile.* Which word *Sculptile*, is by the 70 Interpreters Tranſlated *Idol*, as indeed it ought to be, becauſe God did not forbid *Images*, but *Idols*.

FINIS.

33270